

REMARKS

In response to the action of June 10, 2009, applicants ask that all claims be allowed in view of the amendments to the claims and the following remarks. Claims 66-71 and 80-113 are currently pending, of which claims 66, 70, 71, 92, and 103 are independent. Claims 50, 52-58, 60-65, and 72-79 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter and claims 92-113 have been added.

Interview Summary

Applicants' undersigned representative thanks Examiner Shingles for the courtesies afforded during the interview conducted on August 27, 2009. During the interview, Examiner Shingles and Applicants' representative discussed independent claim 66 and dependent claims 52, 60, 68, 83, and 88 with respect to the cited references. With respect to independent claim 66, Examiner Shingles agreed that the cited Cox reference fails to explicitly disclose information identifying previous requestors, of a first access providing host as well as of other access providing hosts, that are determined to have submitted a previous access request that has timed out prior to submission of an acknowledgement corresponding to the previous access request and recommended adding similar features to any other independent claims to advance prosecution. With respect to claims 52, 60, 68, 83, and 88, Examiner Shingles agreed that the cited MacLean reference does not qualify as prior art to the present application. This reply reflects the substance of the interview.

§ 102 Rejections

Claims 50, 53, 54, 58, 61, 62, 64-67, 69-82, 84-87, and 89-91 have been rejected as being anticipated by Cox (U.S. Patent No. 6,738,814). Claims 50, 53, 54, 58, 61, 62, 64, 65, and 72-79 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter, thereby rendering the rejection of those claims moot. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 66, 70, and 71 because Cox fails to describe or suggest all of the features of independent claims 66, 70, and 71, as discussed below.

For example, independent claim 66 recites, among other things, accessing stored information identifying previous requestors, of a first access providing host as well as of other access providing hosts, that are determined to have submitted a previous access request that has timed out prior to submission of an acknowledgement corresponding to the previous access request, and comparing observed information identifying a requestor to the stored information identifying previous requestors. Applicants submit that Cox fails to describe or suggest at least these features.

As discussed in the interview of August 27, 2009, Cox describes a system directed to blocking attacks on a private network. See Cox at Abstract. For instance, when the Cox system detects an Internet Protocol (IP) address that is attempting to spoof an address of the private network, the Cox system adds the offending IP address to a cache and uses the cache to prevent future access to the private network by the offending IP address. See Cox at col. 3, line 55 through col. 4, line 10 and col. 4, lines 45-49 and 62-67. Although the Cox system uses a cache of offending IP addresses to prevent access to the private network, the Cox system does not access stored information identifying previous requestors, of a first access providing host as well as of other access providing hosts, that are determined to have submitted a previous access request that has timed out prior to submission of an acknowledgement corresponding to the previous access request, and compare observed information identifying a requestor to the stored information identifying previous requestors. Rather, the Cox system only considers attacks on the single private network that an offending IP address is attempting to access such that requests to other networks do not impact the decision of whether to allow or prevent a current request to access the single private network. Therefore, Cox fails to describe or suggest accessing stored information identifying previous requestors, of a first access providing host as well as of other access providing hosts, that are determined to have submitted a previous access request that has timed out prior to submission of an acknowledgement corresponding to the previous access request, and comparing observed information identifying a requestor to the stored information identifying previous requestors, as recited in independent claim 66. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 66 and its dependent claims.

Independent claims 70 and 71, although different in scope from claim 66 and each other, recite features similar to those in claim 66 discussed above. Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 66, applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 70 and 71 and their dependent claims.

§ 103 Rejections

Claims 68, 83, and 88 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Cox in view of MacLean (U.S. Patent No. 7,287,071). As discussed in the interview of August 27, 2009, MacLean does not qualify as prior art to the present application. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 68, 83, and 88 for at least this additional reason.

Claims 52, 55, 60, and 63 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Cox in view of MacLean or Olnowich (U.S. Patent No. 5,444,705). Claims 52, 55, 60, and 63 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter, thereby rendering the rejection of those claims moot.

New Claims

New independent claims 92 and 103 each recite using information identifying requestor devices, of other access providing hosts, that previously submitted a partially-completed connection transaction request to determine whether to block the connection transaction request to the access providing host. For reasons similar to those discussed above and discussed in the telephone interview of August 27, 2009, none of the cited references, taken alone or in combination, describe or suggest at least this feature of new independent claims 92 and 103. Accordingly, applicants submit that new independent claims 92 and 103 and their dependent claims are allowable.

Conclusion

It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be

Applicant : Christopher J. Wright et al.
Serial No. : 10/698,933
Filed : November 3, 2003
Page : 16 of 16

Attorney's Docket No.: 24838-0002002 / Security 05-
CON

exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this reply should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this reply, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 10, 2009

/Jeremy J. Monaldo/
Jeremy J. Monaldo
Reg. No. 58,680

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945